

Appl. No. 09/408,943
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 2 June 2004

Page 6 of 8

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-16 are pending in this application.

The applicants respectfully request the admittance of this amendment, to place the claims in a better condition for allowance or appeal. The applicants respectfully suggest that this amendment adds no new matter, and does not require an additional search.

The Office action rejects claims 1, 6, and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Shojima et al. (USP 5,592,565, hereinafter Shojima), claims 3-5 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Shojima and Cok (USP 6,298,154). The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1, upon which claims 3-5, and 13 depend, claims an apparatus for reproducing handwritten input that includes a selection unit that selects a display font from among a plurality of fonts based on a comparison of one or more handwritten characters with one or more corresponding characters in each of the plurality of fonts.

Independent claims 6 and 8, upon which claims 14 and 15 depend, claims a system for transmission of handwritten input that includes a selection unit for selecting a select font from a plurality of predefined fonts based on a comparison of one or more handwritten characters with characters in each of the plurality of predefined fonts, and a transmitter for transmitting a font identification of the select font.

Independent claim 9, upon which claims 10-12 and 16 depend, claims a method of reproducing handwritten input that includes selecting a select font from a plurality of predefined fonts, based on a comparison of handwritten characters with characters in each of the plurality of predefined fonts and displaying characters corresponding to the handwritten characters in the select font.

Neither Shojima nor Cok teach or suggest selecting a font based on a comparison of handwritten characters to characters in each of a plurality of fonts.

The Examiner's attention is requested to MPEP 2142, wherein it is stated:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.*"

Appl. No. 09/408,943
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 2 June 2004

Page 7 of 8

The Office action asserts that Shojima teaches a selection unit for selecting a display font from among a plurality of fonts at column 3, lines 36-48 (Office action page 2, paragraph 2, lines 6-7). The applicants disagree with this characterization of Shojima. The following is the cited text from Shojima:

"A basic operation of the present apparatus is illustrated in FIG. 2. When a menu 3 on the tablet 2 is selected by a pen, the menu processing unit 6 is activated to determine the data processing mode and transfer direction. When a character is entered by hand-writing in a character input area 4 on the tablet 2, the input stroke processing unit 5 is activated. For example, when a menu item "recognition" is selected, the menu processing unit 6 sets a recognition mode and a transfer direction to the display unit 8. The input stroke processing unit 5 recognizes the next hand written input character, and a result of recognition is transferred to the display unit 8 for display."

The applicants respectfully note the absence of the word "font" in the cited text, and the absence of the font selector asserted in the Office action.

In response to the applicants' remarks of 26 September 2003, the Examiner cites Shojima's character recognition apparatus as including the applicants' claimed font selector. The applicants respectfully suggest that the Examiner is confusing character recognition with font selection. Character recognition identifies a character, such as the letter "a" from a plurality of characters, such as "a" to "z". Font selection identifies a font, such as "arial" from a plurality of fonts, such as "arial", "courier", "times", etc. Shojima teaches character recognition, and not font selection, based on handwritten input. Shojima allows a user to select a display font from a number of fonts, including a user-created font, but Shojima does not teach a selection unit that selects such a font by comparing handwritten characters to characters in a variety of fonts.

Cok teaches melding handwritten input with a "normative" font to improve the appearance of the handwritten input. The user or operator may select the font to be used as the normative font, but Cok does not teach a selection unit that selects the font based on a comparison of handwritten input to characters in a variety of fonts.

Appl. No. 09/408,943
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 2 June 2004

Page 8 of 8

Because neither Shojima nor Cok, individually or collectively, teach or suggest selecting a font from a variety of fonts, based on a comparison of handwritten characters to characters in each of the variety of fonts, as specifically claimed in each of the applicants' independent claims, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 6, and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Shojima and claims 3-5 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Shojima and Cok.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the present application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. No. 41,508
804-493-0707
patents@lawyer.com